

1894-95
(L-R)

Fl. No. 48 of 94
Serial No. 1-15

Sub - Sale of the land of the
abandoned City-hall tank
Baramahalli Taluk and Kullabon
realisations to be used
for putting up baracks.

84

Previous references.

✓
1884-95
(L R)
File No. 1884-95

Serial Nos. 1-15

Later references.

LR 193-99

LR 261-95

LR 368-02

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

Countermarked

Serial Nos.

Part B. for

SUBJECT.

Sale of the bed of the abandoned Settihally tank, Devanahalli Taluk, and hulkanni realisations not to be used for putting up ponds.

1. From the D.C. Bangalore. No. D.1487 D/ 7th June 1895.

Submits applications from Messrs. Birdwood Reid for C.E. Murray Aynsley Esq., and T. Chokkanna, Amildar of the Taluk for the grant of the bed of the Settihally tank for coffee cultivation.

To the same. No. 917/P.325 dated 19-7-1895.

Invites attention to G.P.No. 8096-7/R.1195 dated 19-11-94 viz., that the bed should be divided into blocks and sold by public auction subject to the payment of assessment fixed by the Survey Department. States that the Amildar should not be permitted to bid.

Subscribed

Call the Hoblies of the Taluk proper.

(3) How was the Sale held before submission of the Statement called for by the Dy Commr?

The Amildar's explanation^① was as follows: —

① P. no. 21.

(1) As it was the practice in the Taluk to publish the Sale notice at least 10 days prior to the date fixed for Sale, according to the recent orders, the Sale notice in the present case was published 15 days before the date fixed for Sale.

* This refers to the Darkhast received 30 days after publication of A + B L (Latter part of para 2 of Rule XX of the L R

(2) As there were Darkhast-dars in the Velavangula Taluk, and Dodballapur Taluk, and in the Kasaba Hobli of the Devanahalli Taluk, and as the land was situated in the Boudgere hobli, Sale notices were published in these places. There being no Darkhast-dars in other Taluk notices were not sent there for publication.

(3) Statement 2 was called for ^{for} transmission to the Survey Dept for the purpose of fixing the assessment on the Survey numbers. As it was apprehended that delay in the sale of the numbers would cause loss of Kandayam to Govt for the year Mammatha, and ~~there~~ damage to the produce of the large trees, the sale proceeds of which were till the year previous credited to Govt, it was ~~also~~ thought advisable to sell the lands immediately so that the purchasers might reap the produce of the trees & pay Kandayam from Mammatha.

The Assistant Commr, however, ordered ^{*}the resale of the numbers after publication of a fresh notification wider than before, on the following grounds:—
(i) The rule requiring the publication of the sale

* P. No. 22.

No 558 of 31-1-96.

3. From the same. No. D.581 dated 6th November 1897.

Requests sanction to a sum of Rs 5/- expended in putting up bands on account of the subdivision of the bed of the Settihally tank.

4. To the same. No. 6414/R.2079 dated 17-1-1898.

Calls for the vernacular papers regarding the sale of the abandoned bed of the Settihally tank.

5. From the same. No. D.1112 dated 22nd February 1898.

Submits the vernacular records asked for.

6. To the same and the Comptroller.

No. 639-8/R.266 dated 23rd July 1898.

Sanctions the expenditure of Rs 8/- out of the Mulbanni realisations and invites attention of the Deputy Commissioner and the General Assistant Commissioner to the irregularity

of the course adopted by the Amildar in directing the Amildar to utilize Rs 8/- out of Mulbanni realisations instead of obtaining sanction therefor in due course.

7. To the same. No. 639/R.266 dated 23rd July 1898.

Makes certain observations in re the two abortive sales of the bed of the Settihally tank and directs the Deputy Commissioner to personally attend to the question of the sale and report the action taken by him.

8. From the same. No. D.113 dated 27th July 1898.

Reports that the Amildar acted on his own responsibility in deducting Rs 8/- and that he has been warned against the repetition of the same.

9. From the same. No. D.335 dated 9th September 1898.

Reports the results of the sale held on the 25th ultimo of the lands, recommends the cancellation of the sale and proposes the sale of all the lands in question after the assessment is fixed.

10. To the same. No. 2257/P.907 dated 13th September 1898.

Calls for the vernacular papers connected with the subject matter of serial 8 above.

(A)

SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

REVENUE BRANCH.

OFFICE NOTE.

Prepared as per ~~1st~~ Councilor
order on Dy Commr's letter
no. 581 3 6/11/27 -

SUBJECT.

Sale of the bed of the
abandoned Sethiahalli Tank
Regd no. 125 in the Singahalli
village, Devanahalli Taluk.

LAST REFERENCE.

Letter No. 1112 dated 22^d Feb. 1897
from the Dy Commr, Bangalore

put up.

Ser. No.	Extent.
15	28-6
102	14-11
103	7-11
104	13-9
105	12-29
106	10-33
107	9-4
	<u>89-23</u>

no. 5
in the 1st file

In pursuance of the
orders conveyed in Govt Progs
nos 8086-7 3, 19-11-94 and 917
Q. 1197 2-3-25
3, 19-7-95, the bed of the aban-
doned Sethiahalli Tank
was subdivided in Sept^r 1895
into 7 numbers measuring
in all 89-23 as shown in the
margin, and the Amildar
suggested to the Dy Commr
in charge of the Taluk
the advisability of publishing

"the Sale notification in the
 Mysore Gazette. This was
 done. The Amildar however
 issued Sale notices on the 11th * P. nos 12, 13, 15 & 20.
 October 1895 fixing 24th as
 as the date of the Sale which
 were published in the 'Hobie'
 concerned and also in the District
 of Nalavangala and D. Challaq or.

On the appointed date, the Amildar
 himself held the Sale of the
 7 numbers with the trees standing
 thereon, subject to the condition
 that the auction-purchaser
 should pay the Kandyam
 of the land from the year —
Mammatha (1895-96), and
 they were knocked down to
 the highest bidder as shown
 below:—

See Sale List P. no. 17

Sac.	Extent.	To whom.	Amount.
107.	9-4	Mangayada —	1-4-0
106	10-33	B. Gunda Rao —	64-4-6 (including d. cess of 5-2-6).
105	12-29	— Do —	65-14-0 (do — of 3-14-0)
104	13-9	— Do —	68-6-0 (do — of 6-6-0)
103	9-11	— Do —	70-5-0 (do — of 5-5-0)
102	14-11	Bhikanta Rao —	236-14-0 (do — of 16-14-0)
15.	20-6	D. Gopaswar —	318-12-0 (do — of 18-12-0).
<u>89-23</u>			<u>735-8-6</u>

On the 2nd December 1895

(3) As regards trees, the Amildar stated that nos. 15 and 102 contained the most and fetched Rs. 570, and ~~and~~ could not fetch more than that, ~~and~~ that the remaining 5 nos each of which contained 2 or 3 trees, fetched Rs. 300 which was more than the value of the trees, and that the sale proceeds of the produce of the Kunge trees amounted to 30 or 40 Rs annually.

(4) There being no irregularity other than the legal objection, the sale might be confirmed, but if a resale was considered necessary, the Stones also might be included therein & disposed of.

With reference to the above, the Asst Commr directed that his previous ^{orders} should be carried out & the lands ~~and~~ including the Stones ^{should be resold} subject to the condition of the purchasers paying Kanda-yeen from the year Manmatha.

②. no. 568 & 4296
Latter portion of
P. no. 23.

3. Nevertheless, the Amilor
made another report ^{*} stating ^{*} P. no. 24
that he doubted ~~whether~~ the certainty
of ^{the} bids at the 2^d Sale ~~would~~ being
higher than those secured
at the previous Sale, and
requested instructions on
the following points: —

(1) Whether the 2^d Sale may
be closed, in the event of the
amount of the bids being
less than that realized
at the ~~1st~~ 1st Sale.

(2) Whether the highest bid for
~~each no~~ each no at
the 1st Sale may be taken
as the 1st bid at the 2^d Sale,
and what should be done,
if the highest bids at the
2^d Sale fall short of the
highest bids at the 1st Sale, or
if the bidders at the previous
Sale do not consent to take
up the lands ~~even for the~~
even for the highest bids
at the 1st Sale.

4. In reply the Amilor
was informed that there
was no occasion to apprehend
the probability of lower bids

@ no. 612 8, 5/3 196
P. no. 24.

± P. no. 18

the Amildar, [±] submitted the records to the 1st Asst. Commr. with a report stating that numbers 15 and 102 which contained a large number of valuable Honge trees and stones of the old tank bund, [±] exceeded much more than the estimated value of the trees & the stones, and that the reason for a very low price (1Rs) of no. 107 was its unfitness for cultivation and the existence of a track therein, and that there being no Takararo or complaints, the Sale ^{might} be confirmed. The Asst. Commr. however, called for explanation on the following points:—

N^o 49983 30.12.95
P. no. 18.

- (1) Why was the Sale held before the expiry of 30 days' interval from the date of the Sale notice, contrary to the Revenue Rules?
- (2) Why was not the Sale notice caused to be published in the adjoining Taluk, and in

notice at least 10 days
prior to the date fixed for
Sale applies to Partcharts
received 30 days after
the publication of A and
B lists. In the present case
the lands were not included
either in A or B list, and
therefore the Sale should
have taken place 30
days after the publica-
tion of the Sale notice.

(ii) The no of Honge trees
in each Survey no ought
to have been mentioned
in the Sale list. Further
it was not clear from
the papers what the
annual realization from
the Sale of the produce
of Honge trees ~~was~~
amounted to.

(iii) The Stones of the old
brand should not have
been sold, but should
have been reserved for
the use of Govt at any
future time, and a note
to that effect should have
been made in the Sale list.

No. 735 of 14.5.96
P. no. 25

(313-7-0) V

Sale amount, which fell short of the highest bid at the 1st Sale by Rs. 622-1-6, was not a proper price for the lands and the trees & stones therein contained, the Dy. Asst. Commr. cancelled the Sale and ordered the purchase money ^{which was held in deposit} being paid back to the parties concerned.

P. no. 42

7. On the 27th June 1896, the auction-purchasers Gopalachar and Srikanthadas complained to the Dy. Commr. about the cancellation of the Sale alleging the same facts as those stated by the Amildar, as the reason for the low price of the lands. The Dy. Commr. having sent for ^{& perused} the records, ordered that the lands need not be given out for cultivation for the present.

[Here ends the history of the
of the lands]

8 Another in ⁸ y in
this Connection is the expenditure

of Rs. 8 on account of boundary
marks from the Hulbarni
realizations for the year
1896-97. In June 1895
an advance of Rs. 50 appears
to have been given to the + P. no. 43
Amildar to meet the cost
of repairs of boundary
marks. Out of this the
Amildar spent 8 Rs. for
putting up boundary marks
of the sub-divided fields
in the tank bed above referred
to. To recover this amount
the Amildar utilized 8 Rs.
out of the Hulbarni realizations
under the orders of the then
Dy. Commr. and spent it at
Commr. The present Dy.
Commr. requests ratification
of this act, ~~as the proposed tank~~ - 80 -

~~not a proper course~~
The amount has been taken & spent.
Submitted for approval of Secy of Agr.

11/3/90 In his letter no: 581

Dated 6th November 1897
The Dy. Commr. merely solicited
ratification of action
taken as regards payment
of Rs. 8/- out of Hulbarni
realizations towards
the

The Asst Commr further directed the Amildar to himself examine the large trees and record their estimated value, before holding the re-sale.

2. The Amildar accordingly issued fresh notifications of sale on the 3^d Feb. 1896 fixing 28th March as the date of sale, and mentioning therein the no of trees, stones &c in each Survey no. He however submitted a further report as stated below, to the Asst Commr for a reconsideration of his previous orders:—

(1) At the 1st Sale ^{the land} fetched more than the estimated value of the trees & stones ~~existing~~ existing in them. Although 3 months elapsed since the date of the sale, there were no Takararo, and yet the re-sale was ordered owing to a technical objection,

② P. no 27 to $\frac{38}{2}$.

③ P. no. 23

and this would result
in a loss of one year's
Kandayem to Govt.

(2) If there had been
any demand for the
Stones, they would have
been disposed of long
ago, and therefore there
would be no benefit
in reserving them to Govt.,
as, if they be reserved,
and there be any appli-
cations hereafter, the
purchasers of the land
would not ^{they} allow any
body to enter upon
their land and to remove
the Stones to the damage
of such land. If, on
the other hand, the Stones were to
be removed before the
Sale of the lands, and
reserved for Govt, the
cost of removal would
be large & it would be
difficult to secure them
from being lost - on
these considerations alone
the Stones ~~can~~ also were
included in the Sale. —

the 2^d Sale, before it actually
 took place, but that on the
 other hand there was every
 likelihood of the Court getting
 a larger amount than before
 especially when the Sale
 notice was published more
 fully, and that the said
 right at his discretion commencing
 the first bid from such amount
 as might be deemed proper.

5. The Sale notices having been
 published in all the notices
 of the Taluk proper as
 well as in the Taluk of
 Bangalore, Doddaballapur,
 Nelamangala, Siddaghatta,
 Chichaballapur and Hoskote,
 the Sale was held on the date
 fixed, viz 28th March 1896, in
 the presence of the Amildar
 with the following result -

vide Sale list P. no. $\frac{38}{3}$

Extent.		For -	
S. no. 15.	20-6	with 333 trees valued at Rs 30 & Stones valued at Rs 30	to Gopalachar - 125-6-0 (318-12-0)
Do - 102	14-11	with 673 trees valued at Rs. 30 & Stones valued at 3000.	Spikant Rao. 145-12-0 (306-12-0)
Do - 103	9-11	with 18 trees & 2 stone pillars valued at Rs 5	G. S. Rao 15-15-0 (90-5-0)
Do - 104	13-9	with 2 trees valued at Rs. 5	Do - 8-8-0 (108-6-0)
Do - 105	12-29	do 4 trees valued at Rs 5.	Do - 8-8-0 (15-14-0)
Do - 106	8-33	do 6 do - valued at Rs 5	Do - 6-6-0 (164-14-6)
Do - 107	9-4	and -	Chick. Ramappa for do 1-1-0
Total including Rs. 100 = 313-7-0			

Note. Most of the trees are Honge trees & 1000. Total

In Submitting the paper
to the General Assistant
Commr, the Amildar St
that at the time of the 1st
Sale, the competition was
very strong owing to two
factions in the village &
~~and~~ therefore the lands fetched a
very large sum, and
that the factions feelings
of the people having sub-
sequently ~~been~~ subsided,
the competition for the
lands also fell down thereby
showing a decrease in the
Sale amount of the lands -
He further stated that the
fact of the purchasers
being required to pay
Randa year from the
year Mammatha might
~~have~~ also been a reason
for the falling off in the
bids, and that the value
of the trees and stones as fixed
by the Panchayatdars, was
taken as the first bid in the
Sale of each Survey no.

P no 25-

6 In observing that the

The Adjutant General's Office
 accepted and irregularly
 printed out of the printer's
 the 27th of June.
 In furtherance of the same 7 officers
 have the comments which I should
 be obliged by their names being given
 in the memorandum.
 Please explain to me whether
 there was any irregularity in the
 first sale.
 (2) Whether there are any rules
 at present which might
 prevent the sale not being
 made.

4/11/98
 5/1/98
 5/17/98
 5/20/98
 5/21/98
 5/22/98
 5/23/98
 5/24/98
 5/25/98
 5/26/98
 5/27/98
 5/28/98
 5/29/98
 5/30/98
 5/31/98
 6/1/98
 6/2/98
 6/3/98
 6/4/98
 6/5/98
 6/6/98
 6/7/98
 6/8/98
 6/9/98
 6/10/98
 6/11/98
 6/12/98
 6/13/98
 6/14/98
 6/15/98
 6/16/98
 6/17/98
 6/18/98
 6/19/98
 6/20/98
 6/21/98
 6/22/98
 6/23/98
 6/24/98
 6/25/98
 6/26/98
 6/27/98
 6/28/98
 6/29/98
 6/30/98
 7/1/98
 7/2/98
 7/3/98
 7/4/98
 7/5/98
 7/6/98
 7/7/98
 7/8/98
 7/9/98
 7/10/98
 7/11/98
 7/12/98
 7/13/98
 7/14/98
 7/15/98
 7/16/98
 7/17/98
 7/18/98
 7/19/98
 7/20/98
 7/21/98
 7/22/98
 7/23/98
 7/24/98
 7/25/98
 7/26/98
 7/27/98
 7/28/98
 7/29/98
 7/30/98
 7/31/98
 8/1/98
 8/2/98
 8/3/98
 8/4/98
 8/5/98
 8/6/98
 8/7/98
 8/8/98
 8/9/98
 8/10/98
 8/11/98
 8/12/98
 8/13/98
 8/14/98
 8/15/98
 8/16/98
 8/17/98
 8/18/98
 8/19/98
 8/20/98
 8/21/98
 8/22/98
 8/23/98
 8/24/98
 8/25/98
 8/26/98
 8/27/98
 8/28/98
 8/29/98
 8/30/98
 8/31/98
 9/1/98
 9/2/98
 9/3/98
 9/4/98
 9/5/98
 9/6/98
 9/7/98
 9/8/98
 9/9/98
 9/10/98
 9/11/98
 9/12/98
 9/13/98
 9/14/98
 9/15/98
 9/16/98
 9/17/98
 9/18/98
 9/19/98
 9/20/98
 9/21/98
 9/22/98
 9/23/98
 9/24/98
 9/25/98
 9/26/98
 9/27/98
 9/28/98
 9/29/98
 9/30/98
 10/1/98
 10/2/98
 10/3/98
 10/4/98
 10/5/98
 10/6/98
 10/7/98
 10/8/98
 10/9/98
 10/10/98
 10/11/98
 10/12/98
 10/13/98
 10/14/98
 10/15/98
 10/16/98
 10/17/98
 10/18/98
 10/19/98
 10/20/98
 10/21/98
 10/22/98
 10/23/98
 10/24/98
 10/25/98
 10/26/98
 10/27/98
 10/28/98
 10/29/98
 10/30/98
 10/31/98
 11/1/98
 11/2/98
 11/3/98
 11/4/98
 11/5/98
 11/6/98
 11/7/98
 11/8/98
 11/9/98
 11/10/98
 11/11/98
 11/12/98
 11/13/98
 11/14/98
 11/15/98
 11/16/98
 11/17/98
 11/18/98
 11/19/98
 11/20/98
 11/21/98
 11/22/98
 11/23/98
 11/24/98
 11/25/98
 11/26/98
 11/27/98
 11/28/98
 11/29/98
 11/30/98
 12/1/98
 12/2/98
 12/3/98
 12/4/98
 12/5/98
 12/6/98
 12/7/98
 12/8/98
 12/9/98
 12/10/98
 12/11/98
 12/12/98
 12/13/98
 12/14/98
 12/15/98
 12/16/98
 12/17/98
 12/18/98
 12/19/98
 12/20/98
 12/21/98
 12/22/98
 12/23/98
 12/24/98
 12/25/98
 12/26/98
 12/27/98
 12/28/98
 12/29/98
 12/30/98
 12/31/98

There is no need
 for it - This has
 been cancelled.

But the Adjutant
 most lamentably
 blundered all
 along in spite
 of the repeated re-
 monstrances of
 the Auditor - This
 has been however
 overlooked in the
 audit.

27.6.98

adjustment of the balance
 of account (£150) drawn
 for putting up banners.
 On this further
 correspondence has taken
 place - vide Secretary's
 Lt. General's order
 on the letter.

- Points for orders -
1. Loss caused to
 Govt & the report
 of Rs. 900 owing
 to the irregularities
 in the case noticed
 above.
 2. Whether the
 adjustment of
 the balance of
 Rs. 8/- out of Aud.
 banner valuation
 maybe accepted.
 It is reported that
 the amount (Rs. 8/-)
 had not been in-
 cluded in the audit
 Aud banner Demand.

14/3/98
 15/3/98
 15/3/98

confirmed

if it had been
properly held.

3. Who were the
persons ^{responsible} for the
serious loss that
has resulted from the
land being left unused
for two years

4. Did the grantee
or anyone ever visit
the locality or hold
any local inquiries to
satisfy himself that he
could get more by a sale
before he took upon himself
to traverse the ground
again saying urged by
the Amildar for Confirmation
of the first sale

M. Madhava Rao
5/7/98

20

I have
 noticed the prospect
 of good material in the
 which would be interesting
 10 days. We
 evidently misjudged
 the matter. We shall have
 to revise it.

* Late notice was given on
11th October 1895, & the
Sale was held on the
24th idem.

You seem to have been
the only disappointed - It
was a beautiful one
to sit and - I hope
a good reminder of
the sale - of
I agree

Not given in these

no

responsible for the loss of
revenue to Govt. - are the
1st General Assistant Commr
Mr. N. Narasim Iyengar
who cancelled the 1st and 2nd

Sale and the Deputy Commr
Mr. L. S. Narasimhaiah
who confirmed the ~~same~~ ^{action}
and subsequently ordered
that the lands need not be
given out for cultivation
for the present, when the
auction-purchasers, Chola
char and Veekanta Rao
complained to him about
the cancellation of the
Sale by the 1st Genl. Asst. Commr.
Commissioner.

(4). With reference to the 4th
query viz, 'did the General Asst.
Commr ever visit the locality
or hold any local enquiry
to satisfy himself that he
could get more by a resale
before he took upon himself
to traverse the grounds
again and again urged to
the Amildar for confirma-
tion of the 1st Sale, it is
respectfully submitted that
the

Chockkanna

viz, whether there are any rules
 which would justify the 2nd
 sale not being confirmed
 if it had been properly
 held? it is respectfully
 submitted that there seem to
 be no rules justifying the
 cancellation of the 2nd ^{sale} which
 was properly conducted.
~~On the other hand from a~~
~~of Govt Progs No 7028-36~~ ^{date}
~~27-1-98 (More copy put up)~~
~~say down that sales can~~
~~of property held should not~~
~~be set aside in the absence~~
~~of goods and sufficient~~
~~grounds. It is a matter for~~
~~consideration whether the~~
 But the
 applied of law laid set forth
 by the 1st General Assistant
 for the Cancellation
 of the 2nd Sale, ^{seems however to be a} is ~~is~~ sufficient
 ground therefor.

Except that the place of
 sale was not mentioned
 in the sale notice, although
 the heading of the printed
 form used required it
 in the sale notices of
 the first sale, it was
 mentioned that the
 sale would be held
 near the land.

② Amount realized at the
 1st sale ————— 935-8-6
 Do — 2nd sale — 312-7-0
 Difference 622-1-6
 ③ - When the
 land offered is
 under law, the
 over auctioneer
 will be settled in
 full measure of
 their contract to
 sell and accept
 it.

3) As regards the 3rd query
 viz, who were the officers res-
 ponsible for the serious
 loss that has resulted
 from the land being
 left unsold for 2 years,
 it appears that the officers

27

of the sale or its failure
 to fetch a reasonable
 price for the land.
 There would have been
 some excuse for the SA
 about letting aside the
 strong protests of the
 Amuldar if he had
 inspected the locality
 & formed his own
 opinion on the ^{value}
 of the land. But ~~that~~
 before the ^{private} ~~SA~~
 before the ^{SA} ~~SA~~ the SA
 former never ~~does~~
~~does~~ officers to have gone
 to the place & his action
 was apparently confined
 to making a ~~series~~
 series of, ~~but~~ what have
 ultimately proved to
 be untenable, objections
 on paper. The result
 was that the first sale
 was set aside & realized
 Rs 735-8-0 was set aside
 & a second sale ordered

which fetched only
Rs. 3137-00 ~~Rs.~~ ^{and}
a deficit of Rs. 12-
1-6. in addition
to the loss of revenue
due for the year - the
quota also was
cancelled by the Gl
Ass't Commr on
the ground that the
amount was below
the proper price.

His action was
approved by the D/Com
who on 18th August 1896
ordered that the land
need not be given out
for cultivation for the
present.

The matter was left
as it was & neither
the late D/Com nor
the present ~~one~~ in
Cumbent took any
further notice of the matter
& it was only incidentally
mentioned by the present
D/Com when ^{requesting} ~~reporting~~
on instructions on a
dependent subject. This

23

Letter Dated 20th July 1898.

The Mr. [Name] will personally attend to the question of the sale of the land under consideration & report the action taken by him.

14/7/98

Submitted —

Order issued accordingly (Govt Pro: No: 639 of 23 July 1898).

The lands were sold again on 25th August 1898 by Mr. Balasubramaniam Iyer, Pro: Asst Commr. There was very little ^{competition} ~~competition~~. Nos. 15 & 102 only were bid for. They fetched Rs. 70 & 70 respectively. The Asst Commr has cancelled the sale & directed that the lands be sold when they have been assessed. (Bangalore Dy Commr's No. 335 of 9th September 1898.)

Not a file
20/7/98
H. J. [Name]
in 24/10/98

Submitted for order 18/9/98

that out of the Hulbanni
realizations of the year 1896-97,
the Amildar utilized a sum
of Rs 8/- towards the cost of
putting up bands &c at the
time of ~~the~~ subdividing the
tank bed into small numbers.

The Dy Commr in his letter
No. 581 dt 6th November 1897,
reported the above fact stating
that the balance alone of the
Hulbanni realizations was
shown in the accounts as
demand and collection and
requested ratification of the
~~act~~ account.

In Govt Pro. No. 637-8 dt
R265
23rd July 1898, sanction
was accorded to the expenditure
of Rs 8/- out of the Hulbanni
realizations and ~~it was~~
~~also observed~~ the attention
of the Dy Commr and the
first General Asst Commr
was drawn to the irregularity
of the course adopted by

them in directing the Amildar to utilize Rs 8/- out of the Hulbanni realizations, instead of ~~the~~ dealing with each transaction separately and obtaining Govt. sanction to the expenditure in due course.

With reference to the above Progs, the Dy Commr. reported in his letter No. 113 of 27th July 1898, that the Dy Commr. authorized no such procedure but that the Amildar acted on his own responsibility in the matter and that the irregularity was pointed out to the Amildar in order No. ^x 196 of the 6th Nov^r 1897 and he was warned against ^{such} repetitions in future.

But as the ver: papers were not sent with this letter by the Dy Commr., the same were called for in docket No. 2257 of 16.9.98. They were Q 907 then submitted by the Dy Commr. with his No. 504 of 10.11.98 but as no paper regarding the appropriation of the Hulbanni

Serial No. 46 of the ver:
file marked A.

that he should have submitted a bill as already directed. The Amildar then submitted a bill. The Dy. Commr. in his order No. 196 of 6.11.97 observed that the amount ought not to have been taken out of the Hulbanni amount and that as ~~the~~ it was already done, the sanction of Govt. would be obtained and warned the Amildar against such repetitions in future.

Draft Record¹ the

Comr.

15/2/99

Draft subd.

17/2/99

Letter of the 1st of 2-98

All orders have been
opened & checked - With
reference to the accounts
in the case of Kana:
of the 1st of 2-98, ~~by~~ Kind
~~from~~ the very name of
the 1st of 2-98 - The
order of 14/1/98, I believe
between the 1st of 2-98
& the 1st of 2-98 lists
have been published,
& there, regarding which
there has been no such
publication - Q

29-7-98

166

Dear

30 days is too long
an interval. As I marked
before before the time
will have to be revised
Please ask in Tokyo
for or whoever is in charge
of the account & note
this matter

by 29/7/98

Do the please
29-7-98
Form enclosed to
N. J. J. J.
29/7/98

Noted & returned

by 29/7/98

SS
note

29/7/98

26

Submitted.

The correspondence submitted herewith relates to the sale of the bed of the abandoned Serti-halli tank in the Singanahalli village, Devanahalli Taluk.

The tank bed was subdivided into small numbers and was sold three and all the three sales were cancelled. A history of this will be found in the office Note marked A. as well as in Govt. Pro. No. $\frac{639}{2266}$ B, 23rd July 1898.

Apart from the irregularities noticed in the ~~past~~ procedure adopted by the Revenue Authorities in the ~~two~~ first two sales and their cancellation, another irregularity, with which the present reference of the Dy Commr., No 74.107 20.1.99, is concerned, was also noticed, and this was

that

realizations, was forthcoming,
therein, the complete file was
called for in docket No 4265
A2043
on 16.12.98 and the same
has now been submitted
by the Dy Commr with No
741 of 20.1.99.

- From the vernacular papers,
it will be observed that the
Asst Commr in his order No
9 of 7-7-97 directed the Amildar
to submit a bill for the amount
of Rs 5/- in question, which he
observed had to be taken out
of the Bulbanni realizations,
as the land was lying banjar.
In reply the Amildar reported
that the land was lying banjar
and that the amount of
Rs 5/- was utilized out of the
Bulbanni realizations for
the expense and credited to
the advance of Rs 50/- which
was given to him for the
repairs of bandhs. It
was then observed in order
No 140 of 15.7.97, that the
Amildar's action was objectionable
and

* Serial Nos 45 & 46
of the ver: file marked,

32
 & ~~other~~ other
 applications which
 had been received
 for this land - The
 order of Court directs
 that the land should
 be subdivided &
 sold by auction.
 The Auditor's
 application
 contained a hint
 that the Dy Commissioner
 (probably Mr. [unclear])
 I might get all the land
 at one time wanted
 to take up the land
 for himself.

The land seems
 to be a valuable
 one -

May the Dy
 Commissioner be asked to
 divide it into
 convenient lots
 & to sell the same
 by auction subject
 to the payment of
 such a premium
 as may be fixed by
 the Survey Dept.
 No favorable terms
 been called for -
 May the Auditor

be given permission
to buy the land
at the auction sale

Q.

16-7-95

Yes - Mr. Am
would have
permission to
buy this land

1817195

1817195

Draft all 93

1817195

Draft all 93

1817195

1817195



Sl No (2)

4

Order thereon. 917 8/19/79
Rev-325

The Deputy Commissioner's
attention is drawn to
the concluding portion
of para 2 of Government
Pro: No 8086-7 dated 19th
D 1197

November 1894 in accordance
with which, the land referred
to should be divided into
convenient blocks and sold
by public auction subject
to the payment of such
assessment as may be
fixed by the Survey Department.
The Amildar should not
be permitted to bid for
this land at the public auction.

(38)

No favorable terms are
called for in this case.

19-7-95

Rev Secy.

A. D. 19/7/95

To the Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District
returning Enclaves.

D. No 1487. Dy. Commissioner's Office
En too ✓

To, Bangalore 7th June 1895.

The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.
Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to the Government
Proceedings No. 8086-7 dated 19th
November 1894, sanctioning the
assignment of the bed of Keshalli
Tank attached to Linghalli,
Deraiahalli Taluk for cultivation,
I have the honor to submit the
enclosed applications from
Messrs. Birdwood Reid for
G. E. Murray Brynley Esq^r,
and T. Ghosh Kanna Chaudhar
of the Taluk, for the grant of
the land in question for coffee
cultivation.

2. Mr. B. Reid, who represents
Mr. Brynley applied for the
land a long time ago and in
order to secure some other
waste but assessed numbers

near Lingbulli in aid of coffee
cultivation has already
obtained them on ordinary
terms.


I have the honor to be,
Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant,

P. Coeffoosawu

For By Commission
me

Jan. 31]



From The Dy Commr
Bangalore to:

To The Secretary to the
Board of Revenue
Bangalore District

Dated 6th

Despatched 8th

Received

November/97

General No.

No. 581

Enclosure No.

Govt. Order No. 917 of
R 325 of
19th July 1895-

Requesting sanction to
a sum of Rs 8 Esprided
in putting up of a
on account of the subdivision
of the bed of the Skettling
Tank, Singalur Taluk
Madhavally Taluk in
view to its sale—

[Signature]

Dec 11/1897

Submitted for orders
13/11/97
13/11/97

The singularities in
this case have been
(1) the loss of Rs
900 and about
(2) The loss of
a payment
& (3) unauthorized
alteration of
bulbeam collection
-tions.

These may be
pointed out to the
Dy Commr & some
-tion conveyed
Subd Dy Commr

Rd 7th Dec.
15.11.97

15-11-97

Whereas the
vernamalar record
of the sale has
been submitted
with a view to

with

27/11/97

Draft subd
9/11/97

No. 581

Bangalore District
Dy. Commr's Office
Bangalore 6th November
1897
8th

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Rev. Genl. Depts.

Sir

As directed in Govt. order

N^o 917
R 325 dated the 19th July 1895, the
bed of the abandoned Shettihally
tank in the Lingahally village
in the Davesahally Taluk was
divided into small numbers and
sold on the 24th October 1895. It
fetched Rs 935-8-6. But the division-
al Officer, viz. the 1st Assistant
Commissioner, cancelled the sale
as it had, contrary to Clause 22
of Section 20 of the Revenue Rules,
been held previous to the expiry
of 30 days from the date of the
publication of the notice of sale.
In the second sale, only Rs 313-7-4
were realized and that sum being

1897-98.

From

The Secretary to Govt

Genl & Res Dept.

Sl No

To

The Deputy Commr,

Bangalore District.

Dated 17.1.98

No

16414

R. 2079.

His letter No 581 of 6th Nov 1897
soliciting sanction to an expenditure
of Rs 8/- being incurred in putting
bhando sea for the sub-division of
the abandoned bed of the Setthihalli
tank in the Singahalli village,
Devanhalli Taluk, which was ordered
to be sold in Govt Pro. No $\frac{917}{2325}$ of
19th July 1895 but which remains
unsold ^{owing to the cancellation of two sales} ~~the two previous sales~~
~~were cancelled~~, the first sale being
~~cancelled~~ on the ground of its having
been held before the expiry of 30
days after the publication of the sale
and the second on the ground of
~~the bid being~~ ^{the price offered being}
~~insufficient~~ ^{inadequate} and
~~too price.~~

With reference to the above
has

has the honor to request ^{that} the Dy
Comr. ~~we~~ will be good enough
to submit the vernacular papers
regarding the sale &ca of the
land in question.

(44)

"By order"

(per order)

6/1/98

82

5/1/98

6/1/98
Secretary

made, that sale was also
cancelled by the same officer
on the 14th May 1896. The
purchaser appealed to this
officer; but the order of the
Assistant Commissioner was
confirmed by the late Deputy
Commissioner. The land will
be sold again on a more
favorable occasion. But the
present reference is about the
sum of 8 Rs. spent in putting
up boards, ^{for} when the land
was divided into small
numbers. The sum was, it
would appear, taken out of the
"kulbanni" Realizations of the
Year 1896-97 and the balance
alone shown in the accounts,
^{demand &} as Receipts. The proper course
was to have obtained sanction
for the expenditure; but however

as the amount has been taken
and check, ratification of the
act is solicited -

I have the honor to be

Sir
Yours most Obedt. Servant

W. W. W. W. W.

Dyfomin prince

W. W. W.

57

6136

189

R. 3695

From

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District

FILE

(5)

To

The Secretary to the
Govt. of Mysore
Rev. & Sec. Dept.

Dated 22^d

Despatched 23^d February 1898.

Received

General No.

D No. 1172

Enclosure No. 1 file

Secretary's No. 6414
R. D. 2079
of the 17th January 1898.

Submits the vernacular
records connected with
the sales &c of the
abandoned bed of
the Pettihalli Tank
in the Pimpahalli village,
Devanahalli Taluk as
called for

Ref

Rev. 24/4/98

26/2 Reference. Subst.

26/2 SS for a

Submitted.

24/3/98

26/1/98

D. No 1112
2/1/98

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore ~~22nd February~~ 1898.

To
The Secretary to the Government—
of Mysore,
Genl & Rev. Departments.

Sir,
In accordance with your docket
No 6414 of the 17th January 1898, calling
R. 2079
for the submission of the vernacular papers
connected with the sales of the abandoned
land of the Bettihalli tank in the Singa-
halli village, Devanhalli Taluk, I have
the honor to submit herewith the
vernacular records on the subject, ending
with the 1st General Assistant Commissioner's
Gadi No 603 dated the 17th February 1898.

I have the honor to be
Sir

Your most obedient servant

A. S. Srinivasan
Asst^{nt} Commissioner in District
Charge.
for Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

Mus

Draft as per order
Sl No. ⑦

Read: —

Correspondence ending
with letter No. D. 1112 dated 22nd
from the Dy. Commr Bangalore District Sale
February 1898, in re the
of the bed of the abandoned
Lethahalli Tank, Regd No. 128
in the Lingahalli village
Devanahalli Taluk.

Order thereon: —

In pursuance of
the orders contained in C.P.O.
Progs: Nos $\frac{8086-7}{R. 1197}$ dated 7-11-95
and $\frac{917}{R. 325}$ dated 19-7-95, the
bed of the abandoned Letha-
-halli Tank was subdivided
into 7 numbers, measuring
in all $\frac{A. 89}{G. 23}$, and the same
~~was~~ ^{on the 24th October 1895} put up to sale, the
Sale notices having been
published by the Amildar
on the 11th ^{the 11th day} October 1895,
the 24th ^{the 24th day} ~~idea~~ having been
the result being that the lands ~~lot~~
fixed as the date of the
No 935-8-6. Sale

639
R. 266
23.7.98
23.
M.V.P.

(55)
~~the~~ The Sale of the
lands was accordingly
conducted on the date
fixed with the result
that Rs 935-8-6 were
realized for the same.
The Amildar thereupon
submitted the records
to the 1st General Assis-
tant Commr Mr. N. K.
Srinagar, for Confirma-
tion of the sale. But
the General Assistant
Commr ^{declined} objected to confirm
the sale on the ground
that ^{Contrary to the Rev. Rules} the sale ^{had been} was held
before the expiry of 30
days' ~~interval~~ ^{of publication} from the
date of the sale notice,
~~Contrary to Revenue Rules,~~
and that the sale notice
~~was~~ ^{had been} not published in the
adjointing Taluk, and
he called for the ^{an} explanation
from the Amildar. The
Amildar explained that
the practice in his Taluk
was

that the no. of Hongs' trees
in each survey no.
not been mentioned
the sale list and
the stones of the old
brand should not
been sold,

~~Draft as per~~
~~order of the~~ 

Read ~~at the~~ ~~the~~

Letter No. 581 dated
6th November 1897, from the
Deputy Commissioner, Bagga-
-kore District, stating that
a sum of Rs 8/- spent in
putting up Chandore at the
tail of the division into small
numbers of the bed of the
abandoned Nethahalli Tank
in the Lingahalli village,
Dewanahalli Taluk, was
utilized by the Amildar
out of the Hulbanni re-
-alignations of the year
1896-97 and the balance
above shown in the account
as demand and ^{collection} ~~receipt~~,
and requesting rati-
fication of the act in
question

Draft

No 637-8 823.7.98.
R-265 23.

Order thereon: —

The ~~adjustment~~
^{Expenditure}
of the ~~balance~~ of Rs 8/-
^{already incurred}
out of the Hulbanni
realignment

realizations referred to.
~~in the above is accepted.~~
is mentioned with the remark that

X. The attention of the
Deputy Commissioner, and
of the 1st General Assistant
Commr., ^{to be} ~~are~~ drawn to the
irregularity of the course
adopted by them in direc-
-ing the Amildar to utilize
8 Rs. out of the Malbani
realizations, instead of
obtaining ^(City) sanction for
the expenditure in question
one case.

dealing with each transaction
separately and

8/2/98
8/7/98
Secretary

16/7/98

The Deputy Commr.
Bangalore &
The Commr. Mysore
Govt.

the sale to be held.

20
(53)
5. The Amildar, accordingly held the 2nd sale of the lands on the 28th March 1896, the Sale notices having been issued on the 2nd Feb. 1896. ^{At that sale} The result of the ~~resale should be that~~ the lands fetched only Rs 313-^{realized} as against Rs 935-8-6 at the 1st Sale. The Amildar reported that the Competition at the first Sale, was very ^{keen} ~~strong~~ owing to two factions in the village * that therefore the land ^{price} had fetched a very large sum and that at the time of the 2nd Sale, the fact feelings of the people had subsided, with the result that the price of the land went ~~fell~~ down. Thereupon the General Assistant Commissioner observed that the purchase money realized at the

21
(58)
Sale, which fell short of the highest bid at the first sale by Rs 622-1-6, was at a proper price for the lands in question, and the rights and shares therein contained, and Canceled the 2nd Sale also, ordering the purchase money to be paid back to the parties concerned. Subsequently, the auction purchasers, Popalachar and Lekkanta Rao, complained to the Deputy Commissioner about the cancellation of the Sale, and the Deputy Commissioner ^{V. N. Narasimha Murthy} having sent for the records ordered that the lands need not be given out for cultivation for the present.

6. Government observe that the omission to publish the Sale notice 30 days before the date of the sale, was only a technical irregularity which did

and that the amount
fetched at the sale
was more than the
value of the trees &
the stones.

was to publish the sale notice
10 days before the date fixed
for sale, ~~and~~ that his ^{in question} notice was
not published in certain of
the taluqs as there were no
darshasthans in those
taluqs. The Engineer Resident
and Commissioner however ordered
a resale of the lands stating
that the first sale should
have been held 30 days
after the publication of
the sale notification as
the 10 days rule applied only
to darshasthans received 30
days after the publication
of A & B lists, that the
no. of 'change' trees in each
survey no. should have been
mentioned in the sale list
and that the houses of the
old owner should not have
been sold.

2. The Amildar ^{replied} reports
that the 1st sale of the lands
^{having} fetched more than the
estimated value of the
trees.

trees and staves existing
therein, ~~and that~~ (there being
no irregularities) (other than
the legal objection), the Sale ~~is~~
might be confirmed.

3. The General Assistant
Commr however ^{directed} ordered
that his previous order
should be carried out.

4. Again the Amildar
again reported that he
doubted the certainty of
the bids at the 2nd Sale being
higher than those secured
at the ^{first} ~~previous~~ Sale, and
solicited instructions as
to how he should proceed
in case the bids at the
2nd Sale fell short of those
at the first Sale. But
the General Assistant Commr
remarked that there was
no ^{reason} ~~occasion~~ to apprehend
the ~~probability of~~ lower
bids at the 2nd Sale, explaining
as the Sale notices ^{had been} ~~were~~
published more widely, &
that ~~the~~ ^{the} ~~orders~~ ^{orders} ~~much~~ ^{much} ~~before~~ ^{before} ~~the~~ ^{the}
~~accordingly as directed the~~
~~Sale~~

24
(57)

The result was that the first Sale which realized Rs 935-8-6 was set aside & a second Sale ordered which fetched only Rs 313-7-2 a deficit of Rs 622-1-6, in addition to the loss of revenue due for the year. The 2nd Sale also was cancelled by the G^l Asstt. Commr on the ground that the Sale amount was below the proper price. His action was approved by the Deputy Commr who on 18th August 1896 ordered that the lands need not be given out for cultivation for the present. The matter was left where it was & neither the late Deputy Commr nor the present ^{Deputy Commr} ~~incumbent~~ took any further notice ^{there} of the ~~matter~~ & it was only incidentally.

25
58
incidentally mentioned
by the ^{letter} present Deputy
~~Comr~~ when requesting
instructions on a different
subject in his letter no D.
581 dated 6th November 1897.
The Deputy Comr is ^{and} re-
-quested to personally
attend to the question
of the sale of the lands
under consideration, &
to report the action taken
by him in the matter.

22-7-98

83
20/7/98 21/7/98 Secretary

To. The Dy. Comr. Bangalore
returning Vernacular
papers.

After issue, the file should
be filed to the Secretary as directed.

83
20/7/98

22

did not prejudicially
affect the result of the
Sale, ^{nor} ~~whether~~ was there much
irregularity in the omission
on the part of the Amildar
to mention in the sale
list, the no of 'Kange' trees
on each Survey no, nor
in his action in having
sold the Staves of the old
bind. The facts ~~stated~~
^{of the case} ~~above~~ show the absence
of a feeling of responsi-
-bility for proceeding the
interests of Govt on the
part primarily and mainly
of Mr. Parsimangar,
the C^l Assistant Comm^r,
and indirectly of the
then Deputy Comm^r who was
generally responsible for
the District. The Amildar
repeatedly urged that the
first sale was favorable
to Govt and might be con-
-firmed. But the C^l ~~Comm^r~~
Comm^r in charge of the
took

took upon himself to set
aside the sale on grounds
none of which can be said to
be sound or to have ma-
-terially affected the
regularity of the sale or
its failing to fetch a
reasonable price for the
lands. There would have
been some excuse for the
General Assistant Commr.
setting aside the strong
protest of the Amildar
if he had ~~of~~ inspected
the locality and formed
his own opinion on the
value of the lands. But
neither before the 1st Sale
nor before the 2nd Sale
did the C^o Asst. Commr.
appear to have gone to
the place, and his action
was apparently confined
to making a series of
what have ultimately
proved to be untenable
objections on paper.


28
irregularity was noticed in this
Office, it was pointed out to the
(61) Amildar, in order No. 196 of the
6th November 1897, and he was
warned against the repetition
of the same.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Herbert

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

new



R1078

Sl No. ⑧

From

The Dy. Commissioner, of the
Bangalore District.

To The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore
Genl & Rev Departments

Dated 27th July 1898
Despatched 28th

Received

General No.

No. 113

Enclosure No.

Govt order No 637-38
of the 23rd July 1898, R-265

Reports that the Amildar
acted on his own responsibility
in deducting Rs 8/- the cost
of sub dividing the bed of
the abandoned tank of Sette
halli from the sale proceeds
of the right of grazing in the
said bed & he was warned
against the repetition of the
same.

Ref

29.7.98

D No 113.

To
The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore,
Genl & Her Departments.

Sir,
With reference to Government
order No 637-38 of the 23rd July 1898,
N. 265,
stating that it was irregular of the
Deputy Commissioner and the 1st
Assistant Commissioner in having
authorized the Amildar of the Devan-
halli Taluk to deduct Rs 81, the
cost of subdividing the bed of the
abandoned tank of Settinalli from
the sale proceeds of the right of grazing
in the said bed, I beg to state that
it is clear from this office letter
No 581 of the 6th November 1897 that
the Deputy Commissioner authorized
no such procedure, but that the
Amildar acted on his own responsibility.
On the contrary, as soon as the

(61)

Commissioner, was directed to go to the place and conduct the sale on the date fixed therefor.

Description of trees in		Estimated value of trees in	
Acres	Range	Rs.	P.
395	1	123	15
562	1	107	14
19	1	5	11
5	1	1	6
7	1	1	12
5	1	4	10
5	1	4	4

Acreage not yet fixed.	
Acres	Range
15	1
102	1
103	1
104	1
105	1
106	1
107	1


3. The sale was held at Singhalli on the 25th ultimo. The particulars of the lands sold are given in the margin. It would appear that there were about forty or fifty people present at the sale; but that there was very little competition for the lands. Survey No 15 & 102, the most valuable of the lands sold, fetched only Rs. 90 and 70 respectively, exclusive of the local cess. The highest bidder in both cases was one Ghonse Sahib. There were no bids for the other lands.

4. The bids received for survey No. 15 and 102 are very much below the estimated value of the trees ^{on} the lands. It seems to me, moreover, that the present purchaser has bid for the lands simply for the sake of the trees, and I suspect that he will relinquish the lands, as soon as he can cut down the trees and dispose of the band stones.

5. The reluctance of those present to bid for the lands seems to have been due to the then unfavorable state of the season and want of timely rains, and to the fact that the assessment on the lands has not yet been fixed.

6. For the reasons stated above, I was of opinion that in the interests of Government, it would be better to set aside the present

Memo continued
Submitted with
reference to order
of Rev. Councillor,
Eastern Division,
of 14th July 1898.
12
18/9/98



The Dy. Commissioner, No. 9
Bangalore District

To The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore
Genl & Rev. Departments.

Dated 9th September 1898.

Despatched 10th — do

Received

General No.

No. 335.

Enclosure No.

Enc. No. 18689 of
R 266 of
23rd July 1898—

Reports regarding the
result of the sale held
on the 25th ultimo of the
lands in the bed of the abandoned
Shettikere tank, Wassahalli
Taluk and the order issued
by the Dy. Commr. cancelling
the said sale

Ref. in
Rev. 12/9/98

Recd
13/9
16/9
Ref. to Mr. P. S. S. S.

(67)

Draft for supply

To the Dy Commr. (10)

(34)

The Dy Commr.

Bangalore Dy.

Rs 225-7
Dated R. 907
16.9.98
16.

His letter No. 113 of 27th
July 198, stating that the
Amildar acted on his own
authority in deducting
Rs 8/-, the cost of subdividing
the bed of the abandoned
tank of Settihalli, from
the sale proceeds of the
right of grazing in
said bed.

With reference to a
above has the honour
request the Dy Commr.
to be good enough
forward the same
and the necessary

Papers connected with
the subject.

By order

^W
W. L. G. D.
For Secretary

35 (68)

D. No 335.

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore ~~23rd September~~ 1898.

To The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore
General and Revenue Dep'ts.


Sir, With reference to Government
Proceedings No. 637 dated the 23rd
A. 266

July 1898, making certain observations
in re two abortive sales of the land
of the abandoned Shettikere tank,
Registered No. 128 in the Singhatti
village, Devanhally taluk, and
directing the Deputy Commissioner
to personally attend to the question
of the sale of the land under
reference and to report the action
taken in the matter, I have the
honor to report as follows: -

2. A sale notice was issued,
fixing the sale of the lands in
question for the 25th August 1898.
As my predecessor was unable
to attend the sale in person, as at
first intended, Mr. Balasandaram
Iyer, Probationary Assistant

With a view to the

*Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.*



Sl No. (12)
1898-99

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore
Genl & Rev Departments

Dated 10th November 1898.

Despatched 11th — Do —

Received

General No.

No. 504

Enclosure No 1 file

Secy's docket No. 2257
A. 907
of the 17th September 1898

Forwards the vernacular
papers in connection with
the appropriation of a por-
tion of the sale proceeds
of the grazing in the bed
of the Bettihalli tank to-
wards the cost of sub divi-
ding the lands.

WV

Now
Please see
if the deed
was not
authoised
by Amthm
- 22.26/11

Per

12.11.98

Ref: put up

19/11

D. No 504. ³⁹

For file

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 10th Nov^r 1898.

(70)

To

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore,
Genl & Rev Departments.

Sir,

In reply to your docket No.
2257 of the 17th September 1898, calling
R.907 for the vernacular papers in connection
with the appropriation of a portion
of the sale proceeds of the grazing
in the bed of the Bettahalli tank
towards cost of subdividing the
lands, I have the honor to forward
herewith the record ending with the
Devanahalli Amildar's report No. 239
of the 28th Ultimo.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

W. H. Cunningham

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

Mrs

35

Se No

(1)

Read: Letter No 9, 835, dated
9th September 1898, from the
Deputy Commissioner, Ban-
galore District, reporting
with reference to Court order
No 650 dated 28th July
1898, that when the
marginaly noted lands
in the head of the river
-dona (Bhadrachal) tank
in the Channarayana Village
Dewanahalli Taluk
were put up for sale
on the 25th August 1898
the most important of
the lands, viz, Nos 15
and 102 fetched the low
bids of Rs 30 and 40 re-
spectively; there being no
bidders for the remain-
-ing Nos, and recommend-
-ing the cancellation of
the sale now held and
proposing the sale of all

Survey No	Extent
	4-9
15	30-6
102	14-11
103	0-
104	13-9
105	12-22
106	10-33
107	2-

the lands in question
after the assessment is
fixed.

✓
Order thereon No. 3200 of 4-11-98.

Recorded. R. 1257.4.

Secret

W
11/11/98
for Secretary

To the Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

low

Draft as per orders.

To

Sl No (12)

The Dy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

W file.

No 4265-R. 2043.

Date 16th December 1898.

16

His letter No 504 37 12. 11. 98,

Submitting a file of ver. papers
on the subject of the appropriation
of a portion of sale proceeds of
the right of grazing in the bed of
the Sannalli tank, Devanahalli
Taluk, towards the cost of
subdividing the ^{tank} bed.

Has the honor to observe
that ^{the} ver. file ^{put up} submitted is
not complete inasmuch as no
papers on the appropriation of the
sale proceeds question is for-
coming and to request that the
entire file of ver. papers may be
forwarded ^{to this office} submitted for reference.

Enclosures are returned herewith.

"By order"

W
16/12/98
For Secretary

Sl No

(15)

Read:-

Correspondence ending on
docket No 741 of 20th January,
from the Dy Commr, Bangalore
Dt., reporting, with reference
Govt. Pro. No 637-8 of 23rd Jan
R265
1898, that he did not, ~~authorize~~
~~the Amildar~~ ^{Mr. P. P. P.} authorize the
Amildar of the Devanahalli Taluk
to utilize the sum of Rs 8/- out
of the Hulbanni realizations for
1896-97 towards the cost of
putting up bands &c when
the ~~aband~~ bed of the abandoned
tank of Setthihalli in the Singa-
halleri village, was subdivided
for being sold by auction but
that the Amildar ^{who} did it on his
own responsibility, ~~which~~
~~irregularity was pointed out~~ ^{which}
~~to him and against the~~ ^{was warned}
~~recurrence of which he was~~
~~being warned.~~ ^{Then & the}

Order thereon:-

Recorded.


For Secretary.

To
The Dy Commr, Bangalore
Dt., return - no. paper 8

✓
15-2. S 18/2/99
2753
2753
u: 2 files of V.P.

sent

(12)



(12)

To The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore

Dated 20th 2 General & Revenue Dept

Despatched 21st January 1899

Received

General No.

No. 741

Enclosure No. 2 files of Mr. Papers

Receipts: Clock No. 4265
or 2043

of 16th Dec 1898

Submits Mr. Record
relating to the appro-
-priation of a portion of the
Sale proceeds of the rights of
grazing in the bed of the
Pettihalli Tank, towards
halli Taluk towards the
cost of subdividing the
same bed -

Sub 31.1.99
Refco put up
31/1/99. Subo with a note
15/2

D No 741.

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 20 January 1899.

Sub 2 files to
Per: Papers

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore,
Genl & Rev Departments.

Sir,

As called for in your
docket No 4265 of the 16th ultimo,
R2043
I have the honor to forward here-
with, with perists, the entire ver-
nacular records relating to the ap-
propriation of a portion of the sale
proceeds of the right of grazing
in the bed of the Settilhalli Tank,
Devanhalli Taluk, towards the cost
of subdividing the Tank bed.

I have the honor to be

Sir

Your most obedient servant

M. A. M. A. M. A. M.

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

None

11. To the same. No. 3260/E.1259 dated 4th November 1898.

Records the subject matter of serial 9 above.

12. From the same. No. I.504 dated 10th November 1898.

Forwards the vernacular papers asked for in serial 10.

13. To the same. No. 4285/E.2043 dated 18th December 1898.

Requests that the entire file of vernacular papers may be forwarded inasmuch as the above is incomplete.

14. From the same. No. D.741 dated 20th January 1899.

Submits the entire vernacular records relating to the appropriation of a portion of the sale proceeds of the right of grazing in the bed of the Bettihally tank.

15. To the same. No. 5652/R.2753 dated 18th February 1899.

Records the above.

*Revised
to be
indexed
and
forwarded
12/8/11*